DCCUMENT RESUME

ED 033 977 UD 005 430

AUTHOR	Williams, Thelma M.
TITLE	Supportive Services for Socially Maladjusted Children in Regular Schools. Evaluation of New York City Title I Educational Projects, 1966-67.
INSTITUTION	Center for Urban Education, New York, N.Y. Committee on Field Research and Evaluation.
Spons Agency	New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y.
Pub Date	Oct 67
Note	64p.
EDRS Price	EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$3.30
Descriptors	Academic Achievement, Career Planning, Elementary School Students, *Emotionally Disturbed Children, Guidance Services, Junior High School Students, *Program Evaluation, *Socially Maladjusted, *Specialists, *Special Services, Therapeutic Environment
Identifiers	Early Identification Program, EIP, New York City, Supportive Services Program

Abstract

Evaluated are several programs for socially maladjusted public school children. These supportive services are an Early Identification Program, Junior Guidance classes, Special Guidance classes, and Career Guidance classes. Assessment focused on implementation of the Board of Education's plan to augment special services in these programs, and on behavior, achievement, and attitudes of the students. Information about each of these special programs is reported separately. The conclusions and recommendations indicate that, even with augmented personnel, the services are inadequate for the demand, there is a scarcity of trained professionals, and also a lack of clarity about admission and organizational policies. The Junior Guidance and Special Guidance classes should have effective overall supervision, and the Career Guidance Program needs clarification of basic goals, admission policies, and curriculum development. For a history and description of ESEA Title I in New York City, see ED 029 071. For a related study in selected institution schools, see ED 029 936. (NH)

05430 E

PROGRAM REFERENCE SERVICE
CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION

ED033977

EVALUATION OF NEW YORK CITY TITLE I

EDUCATIONAL PROJECTS 1966-67 General

SUPPORTIVE SERVICES FOR SOCIALLY MALADJUSTED

CHILDREN IN REGULAR SCHOOLS

By Thelma M. Williams

October 1967

UD 005 430

The Center For Urban Education

33 West 42nd St., New York, N.Y. 10036

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

05430 E
PROGRAM REFERENCE SERVICE
CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION

Center for Urban Education
33 West 42nd Street
New York, New York 10036

ED033977

SUPPORTIVE SERVICES FOR SOCIALLY MALADJUSTED CHILDREN IN REGULAR SCHOOLS

Thelma M. Williams

Evaluation of a New York City school district educational project funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (PL 89-10), performed under contract with the Board of Education of the City of New York for the 1966-67 school year.

UD 005 430

Committee on Field Research and Evaluation
Joseph Krevisky, Assistant Director

October 1967

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I	INTRODUCTION	1
II	THE EVALUATION DESIGN	8
III	THE EARLY IDENTIFICATION PROGRAM (E.I.P.) . . .	10
IV	JUNIOR GUIDANCE	14
V	SPECIAL GUIDANCE	21
VI	CAREER GUIDANCE	28
VII	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	32
	APPENDIX A: Tables . . . (No tables in this report)	
	APPENDIX B: Instruments	B1
	APPENDIX C: Staff List	C1

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

Description of the Project

On September 1, 1966, the New York City Board of Education received Title I funds to provide augmented supportive services for 12,279 public school pupils described as showing incipient maladjustment problems, as socially maladjusted and emotionally disturbed, or as potential delinquents and/or future school dropouts.

General Description of the Program

The Supportive Services program was designed to aid children who had been placed in special educational facilities because they were unable to maintain themselves in and profit from programs in regular classrooms. The augmented program included additional specialists in educational and vocational guidance as well as in psychology, social work, and psychiatry. These specialists were assigned to newly organized Early Identification programs in ten additional elementary schools (raising the total number of such programs from 37 to 47); to Junior Guidance classes in ten elementary schools serving 266 pupils; to 15 Special Guidance classes in five junior high schools and ten elementary schools; and to Career Guidance classes in ten junior high schools.

In addition, according to the initial project description,

"these specialists were to act as liaison between school personnel and the psychiatric hospitals to which the children might be referred or from which they might have returned. They were to provide continuous intervention in the children's life situation through work with parents, parent substitutes, and the community. They were also to consult with teaching staff in the selection of positive curriculum experiences and in screening out those curriculum experiences which, in their judgment, might have a negative effect upon the children."

Objectives of the Program

The main objectives of the program were:

1. To improve performance as measured by standardized achievement tests;
2. To improve the children's self-image;
3. To change (in a positive way) their attitudes toward school and education;
4. To raise their occupational and/or educational levels;
5. To increase their expectations of success in school;
6. To improve the children's average daily attendance.

THE PROGRAMS AND THE CHILDREN THEY SERVE

The Early Identification Program

The Early Identification Program (E.I.P.) was created to

identify the special needs and incipient problems of children, early in their school life, so that later school maladjustment might be prevented. It also seeks to identify potential giftedness in the early primary years and attempts to provide a school and home program to assure the development of this potential.

This program utilizes a team approach to identify and treat the target group in a school. The school team consists of a full-time guidance counselor assigned by the Bureau of Educational and Vocational Guidance, and a psychologist and social worker assigned on a half-week basis by the Bureau of Child Guidance. The principal of the school confers with the E.I.P. team members regularly. Each team within an individual school develops its own pattern of implementation which is predicated on the unique needs of that school and community. The aid provided might include help to the teacher in providing a better school program for a particular child, help to the child's parents through the social worker's guidance, a program of counseling or therapy for the child himself, and similar services to both the family and the school.

The Junior Guidance Program

The Junior Guidance Program was designed to provide a therapeutic climate in a public school setting which afforded opportunity for instruction, in "low register" classroom situations, to emotionally disturbed children who, for various reasons, could

not adjust in regular school settings. These classes, limited to 15 pupils per class, were to provide individualized academic instruction to these children.

The children selected for Junior Guidance classes have personality and character problems as well as deep-rooted learning disabilities. Special methods used in dealing with these children include:

1. Preliminary screening, including psychological testing prior to admission to the program;
2. Use of a full-team approach in a continuing consultative and therapeutic service. A clinical team, consisting of a social worker, psychologist, and psychiatrist (all of whose services are available, on call, to the other team members), works closely with the school guidance counselor as well as the Junior Guidance class teachers on all problems related in the program;
3. Creation of a classroom situation that might be more acceptant of the children's behavior patterns and might offer a learning situation adapted to their emotional as well as academic needs. There are generally clusters of two junior guidance classes, or several such clusters in a school, with three teachers assigned to each group of two classes. The provision of an extra teacher insures

a better pupil-teacher ratio with more individual attention for each child in the two-class cluster.

The Special Guidance Program

Special Guidance classes were formerly designated as Citizenship Classes. The classes in this program are supervised by the Assistant Superintendent of each district, with the help of the guidance coordinator assigned to the superintendent's office.

There were 120 Special Guidance classes in 1966-67. They were established on a district-wide basis for the temporary placement of pupils awaiting the final decision of suspension proceedings or administrative hearings. In many cases these proceedings may result in transfer to a school for socially maladjusted and emotionally disturbed children. These Special Guidance classes also may include children within a school, who, in the judgment of the principal, require temporary removal from the regular classroom because of emotional or behavior problems. Provision of a smaller classroom situation with the possibility of more help and direction from both the teacher and the school's guidance counselor, is thus offered.

There appear to be no specific criteria for the screening and admission of pupils to the Special Guidance Program. Pupils are admitted upon the recommendation of the teacher in consultation with the principal and guidance counselor. The final disposition

of each case is made by the school principal or, in some instances, by the assistant superintendent of the school district. The children selected may be of normal or even above average intelligence but are often severely retarded academically.

There are no grade designations in these classes although they may range from the second to the sixth grade. One class may include pupils from two consecutive grade levels. When a pupil is assigned to the program, the parent is invited by the school principal or the district superintendent to discuss the nature of the child's problem. After assignment of a child to a Special Guidance class, the guidance counselor works, on a supportive basis, with both parent and child. The child remains in the Special Guidance class until a final decision of his case is made, at which point he may go back to a regular class in the same school, or he may be assigned to one of the special schools. There is no specific regulation as to the time a child may spend in a Special Guidance class, and this period seems to vary from a few weeks to as long as a full school term.

Career Guidance Program

The pupil population in Career Guidance consists of young adolescent boys who are generally at least 14 years old when they enter the eighth grade and 15 or older in the ninth grade. They are usually well below grade norms in reading and mathematics.

Fluency in English is required of those students selected for the program. These pupils are considered to be among those most likely to drop out of school as soon as they are legally able. A weighted scale of 15 items was devised by the Bureau of Educational Research of the New York City Board of Education to identfiy those pupils with characteristics having a high correlation with early school leaving. This scale is used in the spring term of each academic year in the 52 junior high schools with Career Guidance programs in order to screen and select the pupils for the program during the following school year. School achievement, family patterns, school mobility, socioeconomic status, educational level of parents, and behavior are the areas incorporated in the instrument. Those lowest on the scale are regarded as most likely to drop out. Consequently, the pupils in Career Guidance have been identified by school personnel as potential school failures and are often likely to be so regarded by themselves and their peers.

Chapter II

THE EVALUATION DESIGN

The evaluation of the project was organized around two broad categories:

1. The implementation of the Board of Education's plan to augment the existing psychiatrist, psychologist, social work and guidance services.

2. A study of the behavior, achievement, and attitudes of pupils enrolled in the program.

Members of the evaluation staff made visits to selected schools involved in the four programs. Classes were observed, facilities inspected, and personal interviews were held with guidance counselors, principals, assistant principals, and teachers in the program. In addition, data were gathered to assess:

1. The extent and effectiveness of clinical and guidance personnel hired with Title I funds.

2. The reactions of staff members to the program.

3. Screening procedures for the admission of pupils to the program.

4. Pupil attitudes toward school.

5. Pupil attendance.

6. Changes in pupil behavior.

For sampling purposes, a total of 420 pupils were randomly selected from schools in Manhattan, Brooklyn, and the Bronx to re-

present the target groups in the Junior, Special, and Career Guidance Programs. As was indicated, the original Early Identification Program was augmented by the inclusion of ten additional schools, raising the total number from 37 to 47, for the year 1966-67.

An attempt was made to obtain achievement scores on standardized reading and arithmetic tests administered in May 1967, May 1966, and May 1965 for students in the Special Guidance program in order to compare yearly increments. For pupils in the Junior and Career Guidance Programs, May 1967 scores of program and control students were to be compared. However, the scores in all three programs were generally not adequate for study since comparable test forms were not used. The budget provided for the evaluation did not allow for administration of tests for the evaluation. It was therefore decided that the testing history was not adequate to support an empirical study of achievement level changes.

Chapter III

THE EARLY IDENTIFICATION PROGRAM (E.I.P.)

The Early Identification Program was begun in September 1959 as a joint undertaking of the Bureau of Child Guidance and the Bureau of Educational and Vocational Guidance. The program operates in 47 public elementary schools, distributed among the 30 school districts of New York City. The Assistant Superintendent in each district designates the schools in which the program is, in his judgment, most urgently needed.

The program is focused on children in the prekindergartens, kindergartens, and the first three grades of the elementary schools with concentration for this year, directed primarily at the second grade level. There is a total register in these schools of some 30,000 young children, including those in the prekindergartens.

In the 1966-1967 school year, special personnel assigned to the program as a result of Title I funds were increased by:

10 Guidance Counselors (an increase from 37 to 47)

4 Social Workers

4 Psychologists

4 Psychiatrists.

The evaluators visited some of the newly organized Early Identification teams as well as some which had been in existence prior to this year, and based their findings on data obtained from both newer and older centers.

As already noted, Early Identification is designed to use a team approach. The personnel of the team consists of an elementary school counselor from the Bureau of Educational and Vocational Guidance assigned to the school on a full-time basis, a school psychologist, and a school social worker. The latter two are assigned for half the week from the Bureau of Child Guidance. The school psychologist and the school social worker are the clinical members of the team. The principal is the administrative officer responsible for the program.

Despite this standardization, the evaluation team found that there was little consistency in the operation of the program in different schools and districts. One or two of the 47 Early Identification guidance counselors are assigned to different schools in each superintendent's district. The counselors in each district are supervised by a different supervisor of guidance. While there is an overall coordinator for the program, there are different supervisory demands and checks on the services of the individual counselors from district to district. As a result, there are great variations in the Early Identification services within the several school districts. The nature and extent of the service in each school would appear to depend upon three significant factors:

1. The counselor's own assessment of her role in relation to overall school needs. (Whether she limits her intake to include only kindergarten through second grade, or attempts to spread her services to other manifest school needs.)

2. The principal's relations with the counselor and his demands on her time.

3. The efficiency with which the clinical team works in a given school, as well as the availability of psychologists and social workers to insure a complete clinical team in each school.

Principals, in assessing the value of the Early Identification program, stressed the importance of the clinical team being on the school premises and immediately available, albeit on a part-time basis, since they are assigned to any one school for only half of the week. While most schools had the assigned clinical positions, social workers and psychologists were evidently in short supply and not all positions were filled, in which cases the guidance counselor actually had no clinical help available at the school. In some schools, the guidance counselor gave part of her time to checking up on the adjustment of older children in upper grades, since they had been the recipients of her services in prior years. In addition, when the Early Identification counselor was the only guidance personnel in a school, she was, in some instances, called upon to help out in crisis situations involving children in other grades than kindergarten through grade three. Both principals and counselors indicated existence of time lags between identification of difficulty, consideration by the clinical team, and ultimate provision of counseling, therapy, or the implementation of other recommendations for the help of the child.

The evaluation team feels that the needs of most schools

appear to require more guidance help than that offered by an Early Identification team which confines itself to the identification and help of children from kindergarten through grade three. If Early Identification teams actually limit their services to kindergarten through grade three and if the school has no additional guidance personnel, other school guidance needs will be unmet and the teaching and administrative staffs will feel this lack keenly. Most principals indicated that an ideal setup would include an Early Identification counselor plus the clinical team, in addition to a second counselor to meet the balance of the school's guidance needs. This is especially urgent in the case of special service schools, transitional schools, and those schools that are having particularly difficult neighborhood and community problems. If the two guidance counselors cannot be provided, then the assignment of a general guidance counselor to be available for guidance problems on all grade levels plus a permanently based part-time clinical team would be a more favorable solution for most schools.

This proposed solution does not in anyway minimize the recognized value of the Early Identification program. It indicates however, that the provision of this program as the sole guidance facility in a school is generally inadequate to meet the total school needs.

Chapter IV

JUNIOR GUIDANCE

The Junior Guidance program has recently been incorporated into the Bureau for the Education of Socially Maladjusted Children, which also administers special schools for socially maladjusted and emotionally disturbed children. Under the general supervision of the Acting Associate Superintendent of Schools and the Director of the Bureau for the Education of Socially Maladjusted Children, the program is jointly coordinated under the leadership of an educational counselor and a clinical psychologist.

The program is located in 97 regular elementary schools and theoretically serves children from the second through the sixth grades, but the largest proportion of classes seems composed of students from the lower grades. Class size generally ranges between 10 and 15 pupils per class with three teachers assigned to each cluster of two classes.

The program was designed to provide educational and clinical services necessary for children too disturbed for education in regular classes. Those admitted to the program generally fall into one or more of the following categories:

1. Children who are disruptive, destructive, hostile, impulsive, and predelinquent. (Suspension might otherwise have been indicated for some of the children in this category.)

2. Children who are immature, anxious, withdrawn, and apathetic.

3. Children of average intelligence, but with severe emotional problems that result in poor academic achievement in regular classes.

4. Children with more severe psychological disorders, as diagnosed by clinicians who believe that these pupils may be successfully encompassed in the halfway classes organized in 1965 as part of the Junior Guidance program.

These recently organized halfway classes have a maximum register of ten, boys only, with two full-time teachers assigned to each class. The boys admitted to these classes indicate more severe behavioral and emotional disorders than those of the youngsters in the regular Junior Guidance classes.

In order to strengthen the therapeutic focus of the program, the Board of Education made allotments in its Title I budget for an increased clinical staff of six guidance counselors, three social workers, one psychologist, and one psychiatrist (part-time).

The evaluators found it difficult to focus on the newly allotted personnel only and therefore based their judgments on the impact of the additional personnel on the total program. Evaluation judgments, based on teacher and supervisor reactions, indicate that the augmented personnel was insufficient to have had perceptible impact on the manifest needs of the pupil population in the

Junior Guidance program. The total of 35 guidance counselors in the program had to work with 97 schools containing 207 Junior Guidance classes, so each school could not have the full-time service of guidance counselor. In the supervision of the program, shared by the two Junior Guidance program leaders and the area guidance supervisors of the Bureau of Educational and Vocational Guidance, the same inadequacy was experienced and the program leaders petitioned the Board of Education for additional supervisory personnel.

The extra time allotted to each school by the clinical team may have increased somewhat its availability for teacher and counselor consultation, but was inadequate in meeting the need for clinical diagnosis and therapy of the pupil population.

Since this is a growing program, the leaders were forced to seek new teaching personnel from a field in which there were admittedly few teachers with the requisite training for teaching socially maladjusted and emotionally disturbed children. They made strenuous efforts to provide in-service orientation and training for the teachers in their program. An evaluator sat in on several teacher-training sessions conducted by teachers and clinicians and devoted to discussions of children's problems and related teaching procedures. However, program personnel admit having to resort to quick training programs of a few weeks before turning over classes of children to relatively inexperienced teachers who are new to this special program.

In most of the schools visited, the principals appeared to understand the goals of the program and provided a warm supportive atmosphere for its effective functioning. They agreed with the general reactions of the teachers as to the quantitative inadequacy of the services of the clinical teams, in reaching the number of Junior Guidance pupils needing diagnosis and subsequent help. While the teachers felt a general pupil improvement in emotional and social behavior, in that the students enjoyed coming to school and considered school more fun than heretofore, there were no proportional gains in academic achievement.

Evaluation of pupil achievement in the Junior Guidance program was based upon the study of 52 children in Junior Guidance classes and 41 pupils in comparison groups in four elementary schools. The pupils in the comparison group were screened and found to be eligible for Junior Guidance but were not admitted to the program for a variety of reasons (e.g., lack of space, parental refusal, lack of program funds). Those children in the Junior Guidance classes were admitted to the program in September 1966.

Achievement Tests

The Board of Education does not recommend or require that conventional standardized tests be administered to pupils enrolled in Junior Guidance classes. While some schools administered tests in reading and arithmetic in spite of this, the majority did not.

As a result, it was impossible to compare achievement gains in reading and arithmetic for 1965-1966 and 1966-1967 as originally planned.

While the investigators agree that these children should not be given standard achievement tests, there is no reason why some kind of systematic testing in skill areas cannot be done. Since the goals of this program include the rehabilitation of academic skills in disturbed children, it is important that some appropriate type of testing in skill areas be developed.

Behavior

In order to ascertain whether or not any positive changes in pupil behavior and/or attitude had occurred during the Junior Guidance year, a profile sheet was prepared for each pupil in the Junior Guidance group and for those in the comparison group. These sheets provided such information as attendance figures for 1965-1966 and 1966-1967, teacher's comments, a brief description of the child's behavioral diagnosis, and a summary of the child's progress for the year. Data on changes in behavior were obtained through interviews with teachers and guidance counselors, through class observations, and through study of pupil records. Where possible, some pupil interviews were conducted in both the Junior Guidance and the comparison group.

The results indicate that 37 per cent of the Junior Guidance children were perceived by their teachers as "not improved" and 4 per

cent were perceived as "worse." Of the children in the comparison group, teachers indicated 62 per cent as showing no improvement and 17 per cent as worse. (While children generally remain in a Junior Guidance class for two years, this evaluation covered just under one year's placement in these classes.) It should be noted that children in the Junior Guidance classes showed some significant improvement in 48 per cent of the cases studied, in contrast to 17 per cent improvement in the comparison group. Six of the Junior Guidance class pupils were recommended for return to regular classes after one year.

Teachers in the Junior Guidance program seemed, in general, more analytical than teachers of regular classes, and were inclined to note and record even the smallest evidences of improvement. However, it should be noted that of the 41 children in the comparison group (all of whom were judged as disturbed by Junior Guidance screening procedures), 39 were rated as presenting marked problems the following year. Descriptions of even those who had improved suggested that these were still disturbed youngsters. In only two cases did the regular teachers express surprise that the children had been considered for Junior Guidance placement. Six of the Junior Guidance children were able to return to regular classes after one year.

Attendance

Attendance figures of the two groups of pupils were compared for the academic year 1965-1966, when both groups were in regular classes, with those of the academic year 1966-1967, when one group was in Junior Guidance and the other remained in regular classes. For 41 of the Junior Guidance pupils of the sample of 52 for whom

attendance records were available, there was a total of 933 absences during 1965-1966 (the total includes one child absent for 170 days). The median rate of absence was 15 days. In 1966-1967, there was a total of 472 absences, with a median level of absence of 10 days.

Attendance figures for the two-year period were available for 21 of the 41 pupils in the comparison group. In 1965-1966, there was a total of 418 absences with a median level of 18 days. In 1966-1967, there was a total of 256 absences with a median absence level of 10 days. It is clear that while both groups improved in attendance patterns over the two-year period, there was no difference between the groups in the median number of absences for 1966-1967.

The following conclusions may be drawn for the Junior Guidance program:

1. The provision of sufficient clinical and guidance services is absolutely essential to the meaningful functioning of this program. A guidance counselor and the supportive services of a clinical team should be available for each school in the program.

2. For the Junior Guidance program's effective functioning it must have a reservoir of available teachers from which to choose the most able, qualified, and highly trained for its classes. The dearth of personnel indicates an area of much needed cooperation among the public and private universities of the city and the Board of Education to provide specialized training for the teachers of socially maladjusted and emotionally disturbed children.

Chapter V

SPECIAL GUIDANCE

There are no guidelines or printed materials available reflecting the Board of Education's philosophy in relation to the Special Guidance program in the New York City public schools. There are no specific criteria outlined for the admission of pupils to the program, for the assignment of teachers, or for the overall operation of the program.

According to the project proposals, the Board of Education budgeted Title I funds to provide extra clinical personnel for 15 Special Guidance classes in five junior high and ten elementary schools. The following positions were allotted:

12 Guidance Counselors
1 Social Worker
1 Psychiatrist (part-time)

In the absence of any official citywide policy, each principal sets his own criteria for the admission of pupils, the strucure of the curriculum, and the assignment of teachers. Generally speaking, most schools appear to have based pupil admittance to the program upon the severity and the extent of their behavioral problems. Pupils awaiting the results of suspension proceedings are generally considered candidates for placement in the program. The age range of these pupils depends upon their individual grades at the time of placement. However, most pupils referred ranged

from second to sixth graders. Pupils are usually admitted to the program upon the recommendations of guidance counselors after reviewing the candidate's record and conferring with teachers and supervisors. Candidates for suspension, chronic truants, slow learners, disturbed, and disruptive pupils are frequently placed in the same class. The sojourn of pupils in these classes may vary from a minimum of two weeks to a maximum of a year, although pupils are generally transferred in or out of these classes depending upon their teacher's estimates of their needs and the degree of adjustment made. The register of each class is flexible, varying from five to ten children per class. Children are reassigned to regular or other types of special classes when the teacher and principal decide it is appropriate. In several schools, Special Guidance pupils were apparently reassigned to regular classes on the basis of age, when they reached the end of the sixth grade and were eligible for junior high school, and not necessarily on the basis of actual achievement or improvement. In other cases, Special Guidance pupils were transferred to special schools for socially maladjusted and emotionally disturbed children or to junior guidance classes in neighboring schools. The transfer procedure varies greatly from school to school and no general statement can be made concerning it.

Guidance counselors in the program are frequently charged by the principal with the supervision of the program in their school.

They screen pupils for admission, confer with the class teacher on necessary modifications of the curriculum, make recommendations for the subsequent placement of pupils leaving the program, and act as mentors to inexperienced teachers in the program.

The augmented clinical services allotted by the Board of Education were inadequate to meet the needs of many of the schools. Although a Bureau of Child Guidance clinical team operated in some of the schools, other schools had only the part time services of a guidance counselor. Despite the added positions allotted in the project budget, there was no perceptible increase in services felt by the schools. Few special clinical services were provided for pupils in the Special Guidance program. In most schools, pupils received little therapeutic treatment other than the limited crisis counseling provided by the guidance counselors. In one school, for instance, only seven of the 37 pupils enrolled in Special Guidance classes were seen by the clinical team during the entire year.

Teachers in the program have had little or no preservice professional training in dealing with emotionally disturbed children and were generally chosen for these classes on the basis of their prior teaching effectiveness, interest, and personality rather than on the basis of their specialized professional training. Some teachers, already in the program, have become interested in problems of emotionally disturbed pupils and have gone on to graduate

work in guidance. In one guidance-oriented classroom visited in the course of the evaluation, it was felt that the small class of eight boys, with a truly interested and sympathetic teacher, was offering these children something more than they might have experienced in their regular classrooms.

Initially, pupil progress in the Special Guidance program was to be evaluated in five elementary and five junior high schools. Due to the time and budgetary limitations, however, the final evaluation was based upon three schools.

Achievement Tests in Arithmetic

No tests in arithmetic were recorded for any of the pupils in any of the three schools.

Achievement Tests in Reading

School A.

The records of 11 pupils at grade levels three to four were studied. Ten of the pupils had recorded reading scores for October 1966. None had reading scores for May 1967.

In October 1966, the reading levels for the pupils ranged from 1.5 to 2.2, with an average level of 1.9 -- one year below grade level for the third grade and two years below grade level for the fourth grade.

School B.

The records of 19 sixth-grade pupils were studied. Test scores for October 1966 and May 1967 were available for 13 or 68.4 per cent of the pupils.

In October 1966, the reading levels of the pupils ranged from 3.2 to 5.0 with a 4.2 average level -- over one and one-half years below grade level. In May 1967, the reading levels ranged from 3.0 to 5.0 with an average level of 4.1 indicating an average regression of .1 for the group of pupils studied. Between the two testing periods, six pupils regressed, five progressed, and two remained at the same level.

School C.

The records of 15 sixth-grade pupils were studied. Test scores in reading were recorded for October 1966 and May 1967 for nine of 60 per cent of the pupils.

In October 1966, the reading levels ranged from 3.0 to 4.4 with an average level of 3.5 -- two and one-half years below grade level. In May 1967, the reading levels ranged from 3.3 to 5.2 with an average level of 4.0 -- two years below grade level. The average increase between the two testing periods was .5. Seven pupils progressed, two pupils remained at the same level. None regressed.

Although the reading retardation in these three sample classes does not differ too widely from citywide trends, it might have been anticipated that the low pupil-teacher ratio in these classes should have allowed for more individual help and more remediation.

However, the sample and data are too limited to permit any generalizations about achievement.

Behavior

The research design called for measuring the effects of augmented clinical services upon the behavior and attendance patterns of pupils enrolled in the program. To ascertain any changes in this area, it was necessary that consistently recorded anecdotal material that presented a comprehensive and behavioral picture of the child as seen by teachers and other personnel dealing with him be made available to the pupil evaluation team. However, consistent entries were not made during the two-year period under study and many of those that were made are undated. This made any systematic, comparative study impossible.

Conclusions -- Special Guidance

If the Special Guidance Classes are to serve their purpose, they must become more than temporary repositories for children with varying degrees and types of emotional and social maladjustment.

They must be staffed by qualified, trained teachers. There should be an underlying, articulated philosophy or statement of principles that justify their existence; as well as a clear delineation of educational and therapeutic goals; class structuring, pupil screening, and placement procedures; and curricular requirements. Some overall supervision of the program would unify procedures, clarify goals, and would serve to utilize more effectively any future opportunities for augmentation of clinical, guidance, and teaching personnel and services.

Chapter VI

CAREER GUIDANCE

In order to achieve its objectives in the Career Guidance program, the Board of Education applied its Title I funds to augment the staff with five guidance counselors, one part-time psychiatrist and one social worker. These clinical personnel were to be available on a rotating basis to ten of the junior high schools in which Career Guidance classes were located; no reasons were given in the project description for the selection of particular schools.

The evaluation team found wide variations in the amount and quality of the clinical services offered in the five schools sampled. From the available anecdotal records there was little to indicate that the limited psychiatric services were utilized. The services of psychologists and social workers were available on a limited basis. However, records indicated that their services were utilized only in cases of the most seriously disturbed and disruptive pupils. Their emphasis appeared to be on showing teachers how to deal with overt behavior manifestations rather than on discovering and alleviating the reasons underlying the youngsters' problems.

The evaluators who visited these schools tried to gauge the appropriateness of the curriculum in relation to the goals

stated in the project description of September 1, 1966. "Junior high school career guidance classes provide a one year terminal program for children who are recognized by empirically established criteria as potential dropouts. These classes, limited to 15 in register, provide individualized academic instruction and training in industrial arts. The special curriculum is highly motivational."

The curriculum consists of mathematics, science, language arts, social studies, corrective English, and industrial arts. All these subjects are taught in a modified manner with lower expectancy standards than those of the normal eighth or ninth grade curriculum. The average reading grade for pupils in the eighth grade of one of the schools was four years below grade level, with the majority of the pupils requiring remedial reading on an individual basis.

Major emphasis in the schools visited was on vocational education. Vocational counseling was offered on both an individual and a group basis. In several instances, career guidance advisors devoted considerable time to seeking part-time employment for pupils in the program. In one non-English career guidance class containing youngsters who had been on the mainland for six months or less, 12 periods per week of orientation were provided as part of the vocational guidance program.

Efforts were made by the evaluators to seek evidence of

changes in pupils' conduct, attitude, and self-image. Anecdotal records for 60 of the 91 pupils in the sample were examined, but they failed to provide adequate or significant data for this evaluation. Entries were profuse early in the term, but were sparse and irregular for the remainder of the year so that no consecutive pattern of behavior or attitude could be discerned from this source.

In a review of pupil attendance records for the past two years, it was found that 38 pupils had improved and 37 had regressed. Thirty-six pupils were absent 10 per cent more during the year in career guidance than during the prior year. Thirty-two pupils were absent 10 per cent less, and seven pupils showed no perceptible difference. Since about half showed improvement and half declined in their attendance, no generalizations could be made as to a positive effect of the Career Guidance program on pupil attendance.

Teacher and supervisor reaction to the program showed a wide range of diversity from those who indicated genuine concern for and interest in the pupils to others who were casual and even disparaging in their comments. There were a number of out-of-license teachers and several who were patently new to the program and who lacked the prior orientation necessary for teaching these children. There was a visible lack of equipment and materials in several classrooms that were visited.

The following conclusions may be drawn from the evaluation of Career Guidance classes:

1. Screening procedures for admission of pupils to these classes need some redefinition. Contrary to the Board of Education ruling that fluency in English is required for admission to the program, a number of youngsters were admitted with very little language facility. Since the factor of disruptive and disturbing behavior seemed to be the most common basis for admission, it was found that there was a wide range of potential in some classes. There also seemed to be groupings of emotionally disturbed, socially maladjusted, and functionally retarded pupils in a single class. It is recommended that a clear set of guidelines for pupil admission be established so that viable class groupings can be maintained.

2. There is some stigma attached to assignment to a career guidance class which may be a factor in the continuance of negative pupil behavior. These pupils have been identified as potential failures and are generally so regarded by themselves and their peers. Some consideration should be given to a redefinition of goals and a reconstruction of the image of these classes, so that this program assumes some higher status in the junior high school curriculum, and consequently, in the minds of the pupils assigned to such classes.

3. There are some implicit ambiguities in the goals of the program -- as to whether these pupils are preparing for further schooling or whether this is a terminal and vocationally oriented course. This factor will be considered in a separate evaluation of the Career Guidance Program.

Chapter VII

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The four types of supportive services for children described in this report have the common thread of focusing on incipient or recognized maladjustment and/or disturbance in children of varying ages ranging from kindergarten through the junior high schools. The outstanding common problems encountered by all four services were related to the fact that, even with the augmented personnel and services made available under Title I, all services were inadequate to meet the existent demands of the pupil population in our urban schools. Other problems, common to all four services stemmed from the lack of teachers specially trained to work with socially maladjusted and emotionally disturbed children.

The Early Identification Program indicated one additional problem caused by its limited grade focus on children from kindergarten to grade three only, so that when it was the sole guidance service provided to a school, the rest of the school's guidance needs were unmet. It is recommended that the Early Identification program be continued but with provision, in certain schools (special service, MES, transitional), for extra guidance personnel for upper grade school needs.

The Junior Guidance Program appeared to the evaluators to be the most effective of the four supportive services studied in

this report in terms of meeting pupil and school needs. Its difficulties stemmed less from inadequacies in its organization than from personnel lacks in supervisors, trained qualified teachers, clinical workers, and guidance counselors. It is recommended that the overall services of both the Junior Guidance and the Special Guidance classes be considered jointly, as well as separately, since they service the same pupil population to a large extent. An effort should be made to staff the Junior Guidance program adequately so all pupil and school needs may be met.

The Special Guidance Program classes varied greatly from school to school and district to district. Its difficulties stemmed, in the judgment of the evaluators, from lack of clear focus as to its admission and class organization policies and from lack of overall supervision of widely divergent classes now operating in this program.

It is recommended that in line with the survey recommended above in relation to all Junior Guidance and Special Guidance classes some effective form of overall supervision of these Special Guidance classes be established, and that a clear delineation of its policies be articulated for the guidance of supervisors, teachers, and supportive personnel in the program.

The Career Guidance Program seemed to need clarification of its basic goals and a sharper focus in its pupil screening,

class organization, and curriculum development policies. If it is recognized as a terminal, prevocational program, its image must conform to this objective and be strengthened so that pupils will see practical value in terms of their future lives, in their being included in this program.

Appendix B - INSTRUMENTS

SUPPORTIVE SERVICES FOR SOCIALLY
MALADJUSTED CHILDREN

List of Instruments

Letter of Introduction	B1
Pupil Evaluation Research Procedures	B3
Pupil Questionnaire	B5
Career Guidance Profile - Form A	B11
Career Guidance Profile - Form B	B12
Career Guidance Profile - Form C	B13
Career Guidance Profile - Form D	B14
Letter of Introduction for Indigenous Interviewer	B15
Letter of Introduction for Indigenous Interviewer (Spanish)	B16
Parent Questionnaire	B17
Parent Questionnaire (Spanish)	B21

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION
33 West 42nd St.
New York, N. Y. 10036

Date February, 1967

M-(s).
Principal
School
Address

Dear Mr(s).

As you know from General Circular No. 6, 1966-67, of the Board of Education, we have been assigned to evaluate the _____program in the elementary, junior, and/or senior high schools.

The first phase of this study was completed in the spring of 1966. The second phase will be conducted during the next few months.

As a participant in the Program, your cooperation is vital and is earnestly enlisted. We are all too conscious of the imposition on your limited time and can only assure you that we will do our utmost to complete our work at your school as quickly as possible and with a minimum of disturbance.

The basic plan calls for visits by a team of people. The leader of this team is Dr. Harry Gottesfeld. He is Associate Professor, Graduate School of Education, Yeshiva University, 55 Fifth Avenue, New York 10003, telephone 255-5600, ext. 415. All further contacts with your school in reference to the above project will be made through him.

Attached is a list of questions often asked by principals last spring. We hope our answers will be helpful. If you have any other questions, please do not hesitate to call me at 244-0300, extension 34.

Thank you kindly for your cooperation.

Respectfully yours,

T. M. Williams

Thelma M. Williams, Ed. D.
Director Special Education Evaluations

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

1. Who is Dr. Thelma M. Williams?

   Senior Educational Associate in charge of Special Education Evaluations, Title I, Center for Urban Education, 33 West 42nd Street, New York City. Adjunct Assoc. Professor of Education, Long Island University, New York City.

2. Who are the professionals assigned to observe and interview?

   A team consisting of educators, social workers, psychologists, psychiatrists, parent educators, sociologists, anthropologists, etc., who know schools, child and adolescent behavior, and teaching, and who are associated with universities in New York City and in nearby areas; also, principals and directors of well-known private schools.

3. Shall I alert my staff members to your visit?

   If you wish.

4. Will I or my staff members be permitted to see any of the instruments you plan to use?

   Yes. You may see all instruments. However, the policy of the Center for Urban Education does not permit us to leave copies of these instruments with anyone.

5. Has the final report of the spring study been released?

   Yes. The spring report can now be seen in the library of the Center for Urban Education, 33 West 42nd Street, New York City.

Center for Urban Education
33 West 42nd Street
New York, New York 10036

To: Pupil Evaluation Team Members

From: T. M. Williams

Subject: Pupil Evaluation Research Procedures

1. Some changes are necessitated in relation to the SMED schools (600 and 400) program.

   a. The augmentation of these programs allows for a comparison of this year's pupil experiences with last year's. Thus, the selection of pupils by school visitors should not be limited to children in the program for one year only.

   b. The selection procedure for SMED pupils is as follows. Fifteen (15) to twenty (20) pupils will be interviewed in a group using a questionnaire (see Encl. SMED). The visitor will select two or three children from each grade level. In schools covering 5 or fewer grades, three or four pupils from each grade will be taken. In schools covering 6 or more grades, two or three pupils from each grade will be taken. It is important that this selection be made by chance; that is, on the basis of factors having no systematic relationship with the attitudes toward teacher and school being studied to the group interview. It should be possible to use the roll book or grade roster in the following way:

Before the scheduled visit have someone choose a number between 1 and 12. Write that number in the "Grade" column at the top. Then count up from it to twelve and then continue from 1. For example, if the someone I asked said "7" I would do as in the example. Then, if the school I visited had grades from 4 to 12, I would select the 13th and 7th child on the 7th grade roster. Then the 2nd and 14th child on the 8th grade roster, the 5th and 1st child on the 9th grade roster and so on until I got to the 12th grade. Then, I would skip down to the bottom and take the 7th and 8th child on the 4th grade roster, the 15th and 5th child on the 5th grade roster and the 13th and 9th child on the 6th grade roster. If any of these children were absent on the day of the visit, simply take the next

Grade	Ordinal Position of Name on List							
7	13,	7,	9,	5,	2,	8,	3,	6
8	2,	14,	8,	3,	5,	9,	1,	13
9	5,	1,	15,	12,	4,	7,	11,	8
10	9,	4,	10,	2,	7,	13,	3,	1
11	6,	13,	1,	11,	5,	9,	4,	15
12	10,	3,	15,	1,	4,	14,	6,	9
1	3,	12,	8,	15,	11,	13,	2,	7
2	8,	5,	9,	14,	1,	6,	3,	10
3	7,	15,	13,	9,	4,	1,	6,	11
	4	5	6					

number to the right or above, and so on until between 15 and 20 children have been selected. In this way, no systematic bias can be introduced. By no means allow the selection of children to be made by the teacher or any other school official.

c. Achievement tests scores and attendance records for the entire school will be collected as indicated in the memo of April 24th.

d. The anecdotal record will be completed only for children who are selected for the group interview. No attempt will be made, however, to impair the anonymity of the group interview.

e. Note from each selected pupil's records when, how, and for what reason he or she was transferred to an SMED school.

f. Any pupil who wishes not to cooperate will be allowed to withdraw without prejudice. Record only the number of such withdrawals. Similarly, if a child does not wish to answer any question, inform him that he may simply leave it out.

g. Ascertain at the outset that the children know what an "opinion" is. Define it for them using some commonplace matter such as "Batman" or the "Mets." Get across the idea that they have a right to their likes and dislikes regardless of who might disagree with them.

h. Introduce yourselves to the children as someone from the Center who is trying to find out what is good and what is bad about their school.

Center for Urban Education
33 West 42nd Street
New York, New York 10036

Evaluation Director: Dr. Thelma M. Williams

Committee on Field
Research and Evaluation
Title I

Special Education Evaluations

Pupil Questionnaire

Instructions: Do not write your name on this sheet. I am goint to ask you some questions about how you feel about things in school. There are no right or wrong answers to these questions. I want each of you to write your own opinions on the paper that is in front of you. Do not speak out or share your opinions. It is very important to us that we have your real opinion of these things. Do not copy from anyone. No one in the school will see any of your answers. Remember, there are no right or wrong answers to these questions - only your <u>true</u> <u>opinions</u>.

1. If you had it to do, I mean, if it were really up to you, would you have: (check one).

   ( ) stayed in the school you were in before you came to this school?

   ( ) come to this school?

   ( ) gone to some other school?

2. In which class did you like your teacher more? (check one).

   ( ) last year's class

   ( ) this year's class

   ( ) I liked both the same

   ( ) I like both the same

   ( ) I did not like either one at all.

Note: All questions and instructions will be read aloud by the examiner who will help children to understand the questions, if necessary.

Dr. Thelma M. Williams
Pupil Questionnaire

3. In which class did your teacher like you more? (check one).

( ) last year's class

( ) this year's class

( ) both liked me the same

( ) neither one liked me at all

4. In which class did you learn more? (check one).

( ) last year's class

( ) this year's class

( ) I learned a lot in both

( ) I didn't learn much in either one

5. In which class did you find more good friends? (check one).

( ) last year's class

( ) this year's class

( ) I found the same in both classes

( ) I did not make any friends in either class

6. In which class did you feel more like playing hookey? (check one).

( ) last year's class

( ) this year's class

( ) I felt the same in both classes

( ) I did not want to play hookey in either class

( ) I wanted to play hookey in both classes

Dr. Thelma M. Williams
Pupil Questionnaire

6. Has anything you learned in this class helped you to get along better at home or with your friends? (check one)

( ) Yes, What? _____

_____

( ) No ( ) I do not know

7. Is there anything you could learn in this school that might help you to get along better at home or with your friends? (check one)

( ) Yes, What? _____

_____

( ) No ( ) I do not know

8. Is there something you would like to learn about that is not taught in this school? (check one)

( ) Yes What? _____

( ) Yes, What? _____

_____

( ) No ( ) I do not know

9. Did you learn anything in school this year that is new - that you never knew before? (check one)

( ) Yes, What? _____

_____

( ) No

10. What was the best thing about this class? _____

_____

_____

Dr. Thelma M. Williams
Pupil Questionnaire

11. What was the worst thing about this class? _____

_____

_____

12. What should be added to this school to make it better for you?

_____

_____

13. What should be taken out of this school to make it better for you?

_____

_____

14. Do you have a teacher who cares about you especially?

( ) Yes ( ) No ( ) I do not know

15. What does your teacher do when a child "acts up" in class?

_____

_____

16. Are you absent: (check one)

( ) Sometimes?

( ) Much, Why? _____

( ) Never

17. What would <u>you</u> <u>really</u> <u>like</u> to do to make a living when you grow up? What do you wish to be?

_____

_____

Dr. Thelma M. Williams
Pupil Questionnaire

18. If your teacher knew about this wish, what would he or she say? (check one)

( ) That's a good idea

( ) You'll have to improve a lot to make it

( ) You're not suited for that kind of work

( ) It takes a lot of education and money to get there

( ) If other, What? _____

_____

( ) I don't know

19. What kind of job do you think you'll actually work at when you grow up?

( ) The kind I wish to do

( ) If some other work what and why? _____

_____

20. How old were you on your last birthday? _____years old.

21. How old will you be when you are ready to stop going to school?

_____years old.

22. If you were in trouble and needed help, is there some one in your class or in this school you would go to for help?

( ) Yes, Who? _____

( ) No, Why? _____

Dr. Thelma M. Williams
Pupil Questionnaire

23. Is there some special reason why you are in this school, this year?

( ) Yes, What? _____

( ) No

24. Do you think you will be in this school next year?

( ) Yes, Why? _____

( ) No, Why? _____

25. Has being in this school helped you in any way?

( ) Yes, How? _____

_____

( ) No

26. Has being in this school harmed you in any way?

( ) Yes, How? _____

_____

( ) No

27. Is there anything else you would like to write about yourself and the school? Write it below.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Thank you for helping us.

Career Guidance Program
Board of Education
131 Livingston Street
Brooklyn, N.Y. 11201

JHS_____ Boro _____ School Year 19__/19__

Father's name_____

Employed Yes ___ No ___

Mother's name_____

Employed Yes ___ No ___

Lives w/parents Yes ___ No ___

Brothers _____ Older ____ Younger

Sisters _____ Older ____ Younger

Physical disabilities (specify)_____

_____

Agencies (welfare, BCG, etc. & date) _____

_____

Ex. curricular activities (hobbies, volunteer work, etc.)_____

_____

PUPIL PROFILE FORM A

Name _____
Address _____
Birth date _____ City _____
Yrs. held over in Elem _____ JHS _____

	SEPT	JUNE
Abs. (last yr)		This yr.
Late " "		" "
Rd Gr		
Ar Gr		

Indicate	Good	Fair	Poor	Good	Fair	Poor
Dependability						
Sociability						
Cooperation						
Self-control						
Work-study						

Goal:		
Diploma		
HS		
Work		
Other		

Advisor _____

CAREER GUIDANCE PROFILE - FORM B

School _____ Class _____ Teacher _____

Ethnic Census of:	N		PR		Other		Total Pupils
	#	%	#	%	#	%	
School							
Class							

Note: Include all students registered in the class any time during 1966-67.

*(i.e. Acad., Voc., Spec., Dropout)

Name of Pupil	Date of Birth	Age: Years, Month 9/12/66	Grade Level 1965-1966	Absent 65-66	Late 65-66	Conduct 65-66	Through 4/14/67 Absent 66-67	Through 4/14/67 Late 66-67	Conduct 66-67	If no longer in CG-Nature of Discharge	If not in CG in 9/66-Nature and Date of Admiss.	*Anticipated School Placement 1967-68

B12

CAREER GUIDANCE PROFILE - FORM C

School_____ Class_____ Teacher_____

Note: Include all students registered in the class any time during 1966-67.

	Diploma	Certificate	Transfer
In June 1966 number in school who received:			
In June 1966 number in CG who received:			
Number in this class expected to receive:			

Name of Pupil	Scores on Tests Administered City-Wide: READING 10/65	READING 5/66	READING 10/66	READING 5/67	MATH 1/66	MATH 1/67	Any Other Stand. Tests Name of Test: Date	Score	Date	Score	Identify extra-Curricular Activity in 1965-66;	Identify Extra-Curricular Activity in 1966-67;
1.												
2.												
3.												
4.												
5.												
6.												
7.												
8.												
9.												
10.												
11.												
12.												
13.												
14.												
15.												

B13

B13

CAREER GUIDANCE PROFILE - FORM C

School_____ Class_____ Teacher_____

Note: Include all students registered in the class any time during 1966-67.

	Diploma	Certificate	Transfer
In June 1966 number in school who received:			
In June 1966 number in CG who received:			
Number in this class expected to receive:			

Name of Pupil	Scores on Tests Administered City-Wide: READING 10/65	READING 5/66	READING 10/66	READING 5/67	MATH 1/66	MATH 1/67	Any Other Stand. Tests Name of Test: Date	Score	Date	Score	Identify extra-Curricular Activity in 1965-66;	Identify Extra-Curricular Activity in 1966-67;
1.												
2.												
3.												
4.												
5.												
6.												
7.												
8.												
9.												
10.												
11.												
12.												
13.												
14.												
15.												

BL3

B15

Committee on Field
Research and Evaluation
Title I

May 4, 1967

Dear Parent:

This will introduce_____, a representative of the Center for Urban Education of New York City who is responsible for evaluations of some of the programs in the New York City public schools.

We are asking a selected number of parents how they feel about the schools their children go to. We are interested in what changes, if any, they would like to see made to improve the quality of education that their children receive.

Your name was selected at random among the parents in the school that your child or children attend. Any information you may give will be kept in complete confidence, and the fact that we talked with you will never be made known.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Very truly yours,

Thelma M. Williams

Thelma M. Williams, Ed.D.
Chairman

TMW/mi

Special Education Evaluations

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION 33 WEST 42 STREET, NEW YORK CITY 10036 212-244-0300

B16

CENTRO DE EDUCACION URBANA
33 West 42 Street
New York, N. Y. 10036

Mayo 4 de 1967

TITULO I

Evaluaciones Especiales Sobre Educacion,

Dra. Thelma M. Williams, Directora

Estimada Madre (Padre):

Esta carta es para presentarle a la Sra. (Sr.)_____ quien representa al Centro de Educacion Urbana, entidad responsable de evaluar algunos programas de las escuelas publicas de Nueva York.

Hemos escogido un numero de padres para preguntarles sus opiniones con relacion a las escuelas de sus hijos. Interesamos saber los cambios que Vds. desean, que se efectuen con el proposito de mejorar al educacion de sus hijos.

Su nombre fue seleccionado para que Vd. sea entrevistado. La informa-tion que Vd. nos de sera confidencial y nunca se revelara el hecho que Vd. hablo con nosotros.

Gracias por su cooperacion,

Sinceramente,

Thelma M. Williams, Ed. D.

TMW:mo

CONFIDENTIAL

Center for Urban Education
33 West 42nd Street
New York, New York 10036

Committee on Field
Research and Evaluations
Title I

Dr. Thelma M. Williams
Evaluation Chairman
May 4, 1967

Special Education Evaluation

Parent Questionnaire

Evaluation form to be used in interviewing of parents with children in Junior Guidance, Special Guidance, Career Guidance or schools for Socially Maladjusted and Emotionally Disturbed children.*

Instruction to Interviewer: Please check "yes" or "no" or fill in answers where indicated. Write any comments you wish to make on the back of last page.

Information Data:

1. Name of student: _____
2. Address: _____
3. School: _____ Address _____
4. Name of parent or guardian (the interviewee): _____

   _____
5. Address: _____
   No. Street Apartment Zip Code

   _____
   Borough Telephone No.
6. Relationship of person interviewed to student: _____

*To be seen only by interviewer.

*Warm up Items

a) How long have you been in New York?_____

b) Has_____(name of child) been with you all this time? (Yes) or (No)

If no (1) How ling has he/she been in New York?_____

(2) Where did he/she live before coming to New York?_____

1. In what school is your son (daughter)?_____
(Name or Number)

2. (a) In what grade?:_____

(b) How old is your son/daughter?:_____

3. Who is his teacher?:_____

4. What school was he in last year?:_____

5. What grade was he in?:_____

If child was transferred, how did the transfer take place? (Was there a hearing, was the parent told the reason for the transfer?)

_____

_____

_____

_____

6. Is there anything different about your son's/daughter's class or school this year as compared with last year? No ( ) Yes ( ).In what way is it different?:

_____

_____

_____

7. Did you get any information, not mentioned above, about his school this year? No ( ) Yes ( ), what and from whom?

_____

_____

Parent's Name_____
Interviewer's Name_____

Dr. Thelma M. Williams
Evaluation Chairman

Parent Questionnaire
May 4, 1967

8. In your opinion has there been any improvement in his/her attitude (way of acting, study habits) at home this year? No ( ) Yes ( )

   In What ways?_____

   _____

   _____

9. In your opinion, have there been any improvement in your child's behaviour (way of acting) at school this year? No ( ) Yes ( )

   In what ways?_____

   _____

   _____

10. In your opinion has there been any improvement in his/her school work? No ( ) Yes ( ), in what ways?

    _____

    _____

    _____

11. What contact have you had with school this year?_____

    _____

    _____

12. Do you attend Parent Teacher Association meetings?
    No ( ) Yes ( ) 1 or 2 ( ) 3 or more times ( )

    If not, why not?:_____

    _____

Parent's name_____

Interviewer's name_____

Dr. Thelma M. Williams
Evaluation Chairman

Parent Questionnaire
May 4, 1967

13. Do you visit the school? No ( ) Yes ( ) 1 or 2 ( ) 3 or more times ( )

What initiated the visit (asked you to come)?:_____

Did you go because you were called or received a letter? Yes ( ) No ( )

14. Is there someone in your child's school with whom you can talk about his/her progress (how he/she is getting along)?: No ( ) Yes ( )

Whom?_____

When did you last talk to this person?:_____

Were you helped?: Yes ( ), How?:_____

No ( ), Why?:_____

15. Does you child use any special school services? Yes ( ), What kind?:

_____No ( )

16. Does your son/daughter talk over with you what he wants to do to make a living (i.e. goal)?: No ( ) Yes ( ). Do you think the school is helping him/her so that he can achieve his future goal?: No ( ) Yes ( )

17. In general are you satisfied with the help your child is getting in school?: Yes ( ) No ( ), what additional help do you think he/she needs?:

_____

_____

_____

18. How do you think the additional help should be provided?:

_____

_____

Name of Interviewer:_____

Address:_____
No. Street Borough Zip Code

Phone No:_____

Date:_____

Parent's name_____

2

Translation of Parent Questionnaire

Centro de Educacion Urbana
33 West 42nd Street

Titulo I - Evaluaciones Especiales Sobre la Educacion

Dra. Thelma M. Williams - Directora

Cuestionario Evaluativo para los Padres

Para ser usado al entrevistar a los padres de los ninos matriculados en los Programas de Orientacion Especial, Orientacion de Carreras Profesionales, y Orientacion en la Escuela Intermedia, implementados en las escuelas destinadas a ninos socialmente desajustados y emocionalmente perturbados.

Instrucciones para el que entrevista:

Por favor, marque la palabra Si, o No, o llene el espacio en blanco segun sea el caso. Escriba sus comentarios al dorso de la ultima pagina.

Cuestionario para los padres

Informacion

1. Nombre del estudiante_____

2. Direccion_____
   \# Calle

   _____
   Borough Zip Code

3. Escuela_____

4. Nombre del padre o guardian (el entrevistado)_____

   _____

5. Direccion_____
   \# Calle Apt.

6. Parentesco de la persona entrevistada con el estudiante_____

   _____

   Nombre del que entrevista_____

   Nombre del padre, madre o guardian_____

Preguntas Informales Para Establecer una Relacion

a) ?Cuanto tiempo hace que Ud. esta en Nueva York?_____

b) ?Ha estado _____con Ud. todo el
(nombre del estudiante)
tiempo? Si_____ No_____.

1. ?Cuanto tiempo ha estado el (ella) en Nueva York?_____

_____

2. ?En donde vivio el (ella) antes de venir a Nueva York? _____

_____

Cuestionario para los Padres

Preguntas:

1. ?En que escuela estudia su hijo o hija? _____
(nombre o numero)

2. a) ?En que grado esta su hijo? _____

b) ?Que edad tiene su hijo? _____

3. ?Quien es su maestro o maestra? _____

4. ?En que escuela estaba su hijo(a) el año pasado?_____

5. ?En que grado estaba el o ella el año pasado? _____

Si hubo algun cambio, ?como ocurrio dicho cambio?_____

_____

?Hubo alguna vista, fue notificado el padre de esto y de las razones del cambio?_____

6. ?Hay algo distinto este año sobre la clase, o escuela de su hijo(a), comparado esto con el año pasado? No___Si_____ ?En que consiste la diferencia?_____

?Quien le informo sobre ello? _____

_____

Nombre del que entrevista _____

Nombre del padre, madre o guardian _____

7. ?Ha recibido Ud. alguna informacion, no mencionada antes, sobre la escuela de su hijo(a) este año? No_____ Si_____

?En que consiste esta informacion?

_____

_____

?De quien la recibio? _____

_____

8. En su opinion, ?ha habido algun progreso o mejora en la actitud de su hijo(a) (habitos de estudio, forma de comportarse, de relacionarse) en el hogar en este año? No_____ Si____?En que consiste este progreso?

_____

_____

9. En su opinion, ?ha habido algun progreso o mejora en el comportamiento de su hijo(a) en la escuela este año? No_____Si____?En que consiste este progreso?_____

10. En su opinion, ?ha habido algun progreso en el trabajo escolar de su hijo(a) No_____Si_____?En que consiste este progreso?

_____

11. ?Que contacto ha establecido Ud. con la escuela este año?

_____

12. ?Asiste Ud. a las reuniones de Padres y Maestros de la escuela? de su hijo(a)? No_____?Por que no? _____

_____

Si_____?Con que frecuencia? _____

Nombre del que entrevista_____

Nombre del padre, madre o guardian_____

13. ?Visita Ud. la escuela? No____?Por que no?

Si____?Con que frecuencia?_____

14. ?Hay alguien en la escuela con quien Ud. puede discutir el progreso escolar, conducta, o problemas de su hijo(a)?

No_____Si_____?Quien es esta persona?_____

?Cuando fue la ultima vez que hablo con esta persona?_____

_____

?La ayudo esta persona? No_____?Por que no?_____ Si_____

?Como la ayudo_____

_____

_____

_____ _____

15. ?Utiliza su hijo(a) algun servicio escolar especial? No_____

Si_____?Cual o cuales?_____ _____

_____

16. ?Discute su hijo(a) con Ud. sobre lo que quiere ser el (ella) en el manana? (meta, aspiraciones?) No____Si____ ?Piensa Ud. que la escuela esta ayudando a su hijo para que mas tarde el pueda lograr sus aspiraciones? No____Si____

?En que forma la escuela ayuda a su hijo(a) en esto?_____

_____

17. En general, ?esta Ud. satisfecho con la ayuda que su hijo(a) recibe de la escuela? No____Si____ ?Que otra ayuda piensa Ud. que el (ella) necesita?_____

_____ _____ __ _____

_____ _____ _____

Nombre del que entrevista_____

Nombre del padre, madre o guardian _____

18. ?Como, segun Ud., esta ayuda puede ser provista (dada)?

_____

_____

_____

Nombre del entrevistador:_____

Direccion_____
Calle Apt.

_____
Borough Zip Code

Numero de telefono:_____ _____
Hogar Oficina

Fecha de la entrevista_____

Nombre del padre, madre o guardian_____

APPENDIX C

Staff List

Dr. Thelma M. Williams, Evaluation Chairman
Senior Research Associate
Center for Urban Education

Mr. Harry Krohn
Supervising Principal
Union Free School District No. 3
Hawthorne, New York

Dr. David Mann
Psychoanalyst
Albert Einstein College of Medicine
and Montefiore Hospital
New York City

Mrs. Marjorie Abrams
Former Teacher
Walden School
New York City

Dr. Maria Bithorn
Department of Relocation
Progreso Para El Viejo Chelsea
New York City

Eugene Bucchioni
Assistant Professor
Department of Education
Hunter College
New York City

Miss Edith Clute
Parent Education Consultant
New York City Health Department

Miss Cornelia Goldsmith
Technical Assistant Specialist,
Headstart
Former Director, Day Care Unit
New York City Health Department

Dr. Hubert Kauffman
Assistant Professor and Staff
Psychologist
Educational Clinic
School of Education
City College

Mrs. Marcella Knights
Social Case Worker
New York Department of Welfare

Dr. Gilbert Levin
Albert Einstein College of
Medicine
New York City

Dr. James F. Sobrino
Supervising Clinical
Psychologist
Catholic Charities Guidance
Institute
New York City

Mrs. Romana Salgado
Staff Associate for Community
and Professional Education
Planned Parenthood of New
York City

Dr. Donald O. Watkins
Professor of Education
Brooklyn College

Dr. Israel Zwerling
Professor of Psychiatry
Albert Einstein College of
Medicine
Yeshiva University
New York City